No. 1:23-cv-04808-UNA

United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

THE EXCELLENT THE EXCELLENT RAJ K. PATEL,
from all capacities,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

PENDING CIVIL ACTION

***PRO SE* EMERGENCY MOTION TO RECONSIDER**
WITH OBJECTION TO FILING BAR
28 U.S.C. § 1361
28 U.S.C. § 1651

T.E., T.E. Mr. Raj K. Patel (Rama CCCX), AA, BA (*pro se*)
The Basis of the United States
Indiana | Georgia | New Jersey
6850 East 21st Street
Indianapolis, IN 46219
Marion County
rajp2010@gmail.com
www.rajpatel.live
+1-317-450-6651

July 31, 2023

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

THE EXCELLENT THE EXCELLENT RAJ K. PATEL, from all capacities, *Plaintiff* v. THE UNITED STATES, *Defendant*	No. 1:23-cv-04808-UNA Dated: July 31, 2023 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PRO SE EMERGENCY MOTION TO RECONSIDER WITH OBJECTION TO FILING BAR

I, T.E., T.E. Mr. Raj K. Patel (*pro se*), AA, BA (Rama CCCX), respectfully move this United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to issue a writ of mandamus to return the protection, Privilege, of the United States back to the Plaintiff, in reconsideration of its order. 28 U.S.C. § 1361 & 28 U.S.C. § 1651. Plaintiff need not sue a particular officer because the Defendant will handle the matter under its "presumption of [internal] procedural regularity," Gonzales v. United States, 348 U.S. 407, 412 (1955) ("underlying concepts of procedural regularity and basic fair play"), that is to the say the "[C]hief [C]onstitutional [O]fficer [(the President who is Commander-in-Chief of the Armed and Space Forces)]" will delegate it to "Inferior Officers...or in the Heads of Departments," which the Secretary of State is both. U.S. const. art. II, § 2, cl. 2. Nixon v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 731, 750, 789, 794 (1982) and see generally United States v. Arthrex, Inc., 141 S. Ct. 1970, 2007-09 (2021) (*dicta* on inferior officers or heads of departments). Cain v. United States, 73 F. Supp. 1019, 1021 (N.D. Ill. 1947).

The duty to monitor status of the State (permitted force holders without a license[1], Seat officials, Basis officials, ranking military, sister state officials, etc.) and the duty protect its actors has been reverted to the Oval Office from the initial Department of State, the one the Father of the Constitution, James Madison, served as Secretary (an officer of the United States) before becoming President. Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 163 (1803). Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 290 (1885). Federalist Nos. 42 & 80. U.S. const. amend. XIV, § 1. U.S. const. art. IV, § 2. Int'l Covenant of Civ. & Pol. Rts. (effective 1992) (mandatory authority); United Nations Convention on the Rts. of the Child, Pt. 1, arts. 16 & 27(1) (effective 1995) (kid's own status) (mandatory executive agreement); Convention Against Torture & Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (effective 1966) (mandatory authority); Int'l Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (effective 1994) (mandatory authority); and Int'l Covenant on Econ., Soc. & Cultural Rts. (effective 1977) (mandatory executive agreement). See *infra*, pp. 16-7.

WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT STANDARDS

"[A] *pro se* complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers." Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). "Pleadings must be construed so as to do justice." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(e).

THE RELIEF SOUGHT

Grant mandamus to the Presidency or the Executive Branch to terminate the intervening causes.

Grant mandamus even if the court thinks that its order will not be enforced so that licenses and other persons have cause to effectuate the mandamus.

[1] Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898, 918 (1997) quoting Principality of Monaco v. Mississippi, 292 U.S. 313, 322 (1934).

THE ISSUES PRESENTED

I. Is Plaintiff entitled to the Protection of the United States as a duty from Defendant, under the United States Constitution, of intervening causes, including but not limited to biotechnology (ies), that cause him stress and a reduced quality of life?

II. Is Plaintiff entitled to the Protection of the Seat of the United States as duty, as a matter of his Ordered Liberties, and as status as a Basis Official of the United States to terminate the intervening biotechnology (ies) that reduce his quality of life and personal Liberties?

III. Is the Defendant faithfully and dutifully required to immediately and urgently do this as a matter of State affairs?

IV. Is Plaintiff caused by a force or power to serve against the protection and proscription of the Thirteenth Amendment?

V. If the court finds that a clear reason exists to grant mandamus, should it use its Big Tucker Act powers to enforce its own mandamus?

THE FACTS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUE PRESENTED BY THE PETITION

I. The current United States Government was formed by the natural born Americans in 1789.

II. Plaintiff is a natural-born United States Citizen.

A. In 2009, Plaintiff was elected to the Basis of the United States; in other words, as student government president of the Brownsburg Community School Corporation to serve during his final year of high school.

B. In 2013, Plaintiff was elected to the Basis of the United States; in other words, as student government president of Emory University to serve during his final year of high school.

C. Plaintiff is a descendent of King Rama I, the Hindu-God who is an avatar of Vishnu, through his older twin-son King Luv, who along with his younger twin-son King Kush, were lawful successors of King Rama I's bifactured kingdom. Patel is a Leva Patel.

D. Plaintiff is a part of the *chh gam* Leva Patel Paditar Samaj through his heritage to Sojitra.

E. Plaintiff is a religious minority, for being a descendent of King Rama and for having declaring himself as Rama CCCX (during this on-going peril), and is undoubtedly being persecuted by the Modi Government, a Hindu Extremist regime. Plaintiff's *varna ksytharia* royal ancestry is also the epitome or social or political origin. Int'l Covenant of Civ. & Pol. Rts. (effective in the USA in 1992). Attacking social status is inherent in a socialist polity.

F. The United States Congress acted preemptively. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-3(a).

III. **Plaintiff was being battered with this technology prior to 2014, but since May 2014, while during his final weeks at Emory University, Patel was told he would get battered.**

A. The depression/stress continued to increase until 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021, and is currently on-going.

B. Patel was told that he would get fat. Patel was around 150 to 170lbs with an elite body composition and is now 418lbs with over 56% body fat.

C. In 2022, Patel's stress was so severe that his height measured one (1) inches less at 5 feet 7 inches at a disability determination.

D. Shortly thereafter Patel went to a chiropractor and was released from stress and measured back at 5 feet 8 inches.

E. Being royal, rich, not-White, biracial or multiracial, powerful, and/or intelligent is a disability by modern psychology. This group gets an insignificant percentage from the "pretty" assigned group too. This group is inherently against the Constitution. This group has one understanding of ableism and sees it as being offensive.

IV. Patel has long held the belief that this perilous situation is to ruin his image, including by making him fat, and using psychological weapons because he is of Indian descendent, which is the most intellectually gifted group (IQ), and more than Jews. In the Indian group, Patel's varna ksytharia makes him smarter and more intellectual than *brahmans*. **See Patel v. United States, No. 1:22-cv-1446-LAS (C.F.C. 202_). See Patel v. United States, No. 22-7472 (U.S. 202_).**

V. Patel does not know the batterer or the person controlling the technology that Patel observes operates closely to the technology spotted by the CIA that causes the Havana Syndrome.

VI. Patel is not speaking about any technology that the United States has inserted into every citizen or category of citizen that does not aid in Patel's current on-going demise.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND RULES

"The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws, whenever he receives an injury. One of the first duties of government is to afford that protection. In Great Britain the king himself is sued in the respectful form of a petition, and he never fails to comply with the judgment of his court…"it is a general and indisputable rule, that where there is a legal right, there is also

a legal remedy by suit, or action at law, when ever that right is invaded." Marbury, 5 U.S. at 163.

"A writ of mandamus is an extraordinary remedy which we will not easily grant. In a fairly recent case, Will v. United States, 389 U.S. 90, 96 (1967), the Supreme Court advised the lower federal courts: [T]he party seeking mandamus has the burden of showing that its right to issuance of the writ is clear and indisputable. Calvert Fire Ins. Co. v. Will, 560 F.2d 792, 795 (7th Cir. 1977) (internal quotations marks removed).

"Mandamus may be granted only if "(1) the plaintiff has a clear right to relief; (2) the defendant has a clear duty to act; and (3) there is no other adequate remedy available to the plaintiff." Thomas v. Holder, 750 F.3d 899, 903 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

"While the conditions for obtaining [a writ of mandamus] may be demanding, they are not insuperable." Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C., 542 U.S. 367 (2004). "The writ of mandamus is an extraordinary remedy…and will usually be denied when the petitioner could have invoked an adequate, ordinary remedy…Only where an appeal can promise no more than a clearly inadequate remedy may the remedy of mandamus be resorted to,…The court will not consider the extraordinary relief a writ of mandamus provides unless the petitioners can show that this ordinary mode of relief is inadequate." In re GTE Serv. Corp., 762 F.2d 1024, 1026-27 (D.C. Cir. 1985) (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). "[D]iscretionary decisions may be set aside under the mandamus statute…if they fall outside the bounds of "any rational exercise of discretion.'" Esquire, Inc. v. Ringer, 591 F.2d 796, 806 n. 28 (D.C. Cir. 1978).

"As an extraordinary remedy, mandamus generally will not issue unless there is a clear right in the plaintiff to the relief sought, a plainly defined and nondiscretionary duty on the part of the defendant to honor that right, and no other adequate remedy,

either judicial or administrative, available." Ganem v. Heckler, 746 F.2d 844, 852 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

Further, "in the mandamus context, a ministerial duty can exist even 'where the interpretation of the controlling statute is in doubt,' provided that 'the statute, once interpreted, creates a peremptory obligation for the officer to act.'" Swan v. Clinton, 100 F.3d 973, 978 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (internal citations omitted). "'If, after studying the statute and its legislative history, the court determines that the defendant official has failed to discharge a duty which Congress intended him to perform, the court should compel performance, thus effectuating the congressional purpose.'" Swan, 100 F.3d at 978 quoting Am. Cetacean Soc. v. Baldrige, 768 F.2d 426, 433 (D.C. Cir. 1985). See also Id. quoting Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 811 n. 17 (1982) ("Suits against other officials — including Presidential aides — generally do not invoke separation-of-powers considerations to the same extent as suits against the President himself."). Swan, 100 F.3d at 978 quoting NTEU v. Nixon, 492 F.2d 587, 604 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (the President may not refrain from executing laws duly enacted by the Congress as those laws are construed by the judiciary). The court may still grant mandamus even if mandamus will give only partial relief. Swan, 100 F.3d at 980-81. And, mandamus must be sought with "reasonable promptness." 13th Reg'l Corp. v. U.S. Dept. of Interior, 654 F.2d 758, 763 (D.C. Cir. 1980). Thomas v. Holder, 750 F.3d 899, 903 (D.C. Cir. 2014). See also Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. Burwell, 812 F.3d 183, 189 (D.C. Cir. 2016).

An Act of Congress is not required to discharge duties of the Privileges and/or Immunities Clauses. In re Neagle, 135 U.S. 1, 2 & 98-9 (1890). See https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/artIV-S2-C1-4/ALDE_00013780/.

ORDERING PRIVILEGES STATEMENT

Many of the allegations in the complaint will look like it comes from paranoia or delusion based on the premise that the pro se filer, regardless of social status, might be schizophrenia (unable to perceive evidence correctly).[2]

Patel has spoken to mental health experts and psychiatrist, and no one has challenged the possibilities of the digital and technological machinery, some of these businesses are even run by current Republican presidential (candidate) hopefuls.

Nevertheless, after stellar performance in high school and the SAT, Patel graduated with a 3.71/4.0 from Emory University and can perceive evidence and his environment in the terms of the enforced constitutional conditioning because Patel graduated with a degree in Political Science and Religion. Patel entered the University of Notre Dame du Lac after performing well on the LSAT but with the induced technological stress being added.

Patel also performed better than many of the top half of the top 14 schools during his first semester of law school. Patel's symptoms are stress where even a chiropractor helps release the bones.

Patel's psychological condition do not affect his perceptions of evidence and facts. Even under milder conditions Patel has own many political student elections. Under the laws of psychology and psychiatry, Patel is never subject to its main law, mental disability, as it is unapplicable to royalty, state actors, social elites, and intellectual elites. See Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (mandatory executive agreement) (effective in 1993). Mind you, the later group may carry the symptoms of the mentally disabled but are in forward evolution. Id. The American Psychological Association Goldwater Rule

[2] Crist v. Republic of Turkey, 995 F. Supp. 5, 12 (D.D.C. 1998) ("Court requires that a "reasonable opportunity" be given to "adequately" acquire "evidence adduced at trial."); Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood, 441 U.S. 91, 115 n. 31 (1979) cited in Tinton Falls Lodging Realty, LLC v. United States, 800 F.3d 1353, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015).

also prevents psychologists from making public comments about state actors and public figures; psychologist and psychiatrists are a part of the executive branch and are subject to the mandatory executive agreements and treaties.[3] Vectrus Servs. A/S *v.* United States, 164 Fed. Cl. 693, 767 (2023) (citing Valentine v. United States ex rel. Neidecker, 299 U.S. 5, 10 (1936) ("Moreover, the Supreme Court explained that "[i]t is a familiar rule that the obligations of treaties should be liberally construed so as to give effect to the apparent intention of the parties.")) (citing Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law). Int'l Covenant of Civ. & Pol. Rts. (effective 1992) (mandatory authority); United Nations Convention on the Rts. of the Child, Pt. 1, arts. 16 & 27(1) (effective 1995) (kid's own status) (mandatory executive agreement); Convention Against Torture & Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (effective 1966) (mandatory authority); Int'l Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (effective 1994) (mandatory authority); and Int'l Covenant on Econ., Soc. & Cultural Rts. (effective 1977) (mandatory executive agreement). Patel is thus gifted and an elite student and graduated with those marks from Emory University, an elite institution because of the "trickle-down effect." See e.g., Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. Presidents & Fellows of Harvard Coll., No. 20-1199 * 15 & 36 (U.S. 2023) (racism mandates an analysis of the Privileges & Immunities clause and the Equal Protection Cl.) (*dicta*) (Ordered Liberty is no longer on mute) and Teague, 489 U.S. at 296 & 315 (*dicta*) (Ordered Liberty & Equal Protection Cl.-Equity). 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000bb et seq. No reasonable psychiatrist, psychologist, or other

[3] Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org., 142 S. Ct. 2228, 2257 (2022) ("The Court did not claim that this broadly framed right is absolute, and no such claim would be plausible. While individuals are certainly free *to think* and *to say* what they wish about "existence," "meaning," the "universe," and "the mystery of human life," they are not always free *to act* in accordance with those thoughts. License to act on the basis of such beliefs may correspond to one of the many understandings of "liberty," but it is certainly not "ordered liberty." *Ordered liberty sets limits and defines the boundary between competing interests.*") (italics added).

thinker[4] can premise an argument against Patel on a temporary mental disability or health because of his own high grade point average or SAT performance from Emory University.[5]

Patel has the affirmative defense of "license"[6] for having the honor, privilege, and rights of his Emory University Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science with an additional major in Religion (*cum laude*)[7]. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(c). Patel has the affirmative defense of "license," "duress," "contributory negligence," and "injury by fellow servant" for being an executive United States state actor to withstanding the prejudicial dismissal of the pleading *sua sponte*.[8] Id. & Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(e). Patel has the affirmative defense of "license" under the United States Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 because religion or grand or fantastic experiences may be perceived as a mental disability such as paranoia, delusions, or schizophrenia.[9] Id. & 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(a). Patel is not a novice to the topic herein or the scientific, legal, and constitutional use of language herein.[10] Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(c). The petition and the facts herein only need to hold the power of constitutional interpretation. See *supra*, p. 8 n. 2. Otherwise, it is likely that the court can be seen as force or branch discrimination not analogizing to white pretty privilege that is also law.[11]

THE REASONS WHY THE WRIT SHOULD ISSUE

---

[4] Id.

[5] Id.

[6] See *supra*, p. 8 n. 2. Marbury, 5 U.S. at 163 (the King will answer subpoenas) (therefore, here, respondent should too).

[7] Patel is the author of "Weight Loss of a Religious Culture" and was given "honors/cum laude."

[8] See *supra*, p. 9 n. 3.

[9] Id.

[10] Id.

[11] Id. Students for Fair Admissions, Inc., No. 20-1199 * 89-90 (U.S. Jun. 29, 2023) (likeables should acculturate from well-liked peers to end their own "stigma"). See also EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc., 575 U.S. 768, 781 (2015) (Thomas, J., concurring & dissenting in part) (decided on colored lines).

The purpose of the Constitution is to provide Safety and Happiness. U.S. const. art. VI, § 1 referring to the Decl. of Indep. (1776). The current biotechnology violates both of Plaintiff's main Protection, a Privilege and Liberty that no one can take away, promised by the United States Constitution. U.S. const. art. IV, §§ 1-2. U.S. const. pmbl. U.S. const. amend. XVI, § 1. U.S. const. art. VI. The Defendant owes this to the Plaintiff because the constitution says so. U.S. const. art. IV, §§ 1-2. U.S. const. pmbl. U.S. const. amend. XVI, § 1. U.S. const. art. VI. People ex Rel. Bakalis v. Weinberger, 368 F. Supp. 721, 724 (N.D. Ill. 1973) ("the duty in the particular situation is so plainly prescribed as to be free from doubt and equivalent to a positive command."). Therefore, this court should grant mandamus.

Patel has correctly sued Defendant United States and need not sue any official or officer by name. See generally Will, 389 U.S. at 90. 28 U.S.C. § 516.

Patel is a state actor, minimally, since 2009. The Oval Office is delegated tasks from the United States to protect state actors first and foremost.[12] Federalist Nos. 42 & 80. The Basis permitted the American Revolution and the creation of the United States Constitution only once it had agreement that its role would be secured. Federalist 80 ("And if it be a just principle that every government OUGHT TO POSSESS THE MEANS OF EXECUTING ITS OWN PROVISIONS BY ITS OWN AUTHORITY."). Madison, Monday, June 18, in Comm. of the whole, on the propositions of Mr. Patterson & Mr. Randolph, The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, vol. 1, pp. 285-291, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1911, Edited by Max Farrand, https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/farrand-the-records-of-the-federal-convention-of-1787-vol-1#lf0544-01_head_163; Madison,

[12] See also United States Order of Precedence by the Office of the Chief of Protocol of the United States Dep't of State, https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/United-States-Order-of-Precedence-February-2022.pdf (revised Feb. 11, 2022). Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898, 918 (1997) quoting Principality of Monaco v. Mississippi, 292 U.S. 313, 322 (1934).

Monday, June 25, in Convention, The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, vol. 1, pp. 398-405, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1911, Edited by Max Farrand, https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/farrand-the-records-of-the-federal-convention-of-1787-vol-1#lf0544-01_head_210; Yates, Monday, June 25, in Convention, The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, vol. 1, pp. 410-416, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1911. Edited by Max Farrand, https://oll.libertyfund.org/title/farrand-the-records-of-the-federal-convention-of-1787-vol-1#lf0544-01_head_211. The Basis' last major show might have been during the Glorious Revolution when Parliament received sovereignty. Hertzler, James R. "Who Dubbed It 'The Glorious Revolution?'" 19 Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies 4, pp. 579–85 (1987). *JSTOR*, https://www.jstor.org/stable/4049475. Accessed 4 May 2023. p. 582 (a more glorious Crown in the next world) (who writes the rules). Like during the rule of Julius Ceaser, when an urgent cry from its Basis-magistrate would come, Caesar, from the Seat, would send re-enforcements. U.S. const. art. II, § 1.[13] Patel has issued that cry for help to the White House several times.[14] Patel and the rest of the executive branch, under its unitary executive theory, relies on this United States District Court to issue mandamus to remedy the problem, and return Patel's ordered liberty. Int'l Covenant of Civ. & Pol. Rts. (effective 1992) (mandatory authority). In fact, the United States is in an international treaty to protect its Basis and its lifelong officials. Id. Therefore, mandamus should be granted.

Patel is a state actor with two titles. Patel started in politics when he was a kid and took to prominence once he made a solo porn or sex tape, as it was elite fashion then, as

[13] United States v. Arthrex, Inc., No. 19-1434 * 23, 594 U.S. ____ (U.S. 2021) (State powers are vested in all branches of gov't, although is a political power exercised by the Head of State).

[14] Rubin v. United States, 525 U.S. 990, 990-91 (U.S. 1998) (Breyer, J., dissenting from denial of cert.) ("The physical security of [an honorable or an excellent] has a special legal role to play in our constitutional system."). Id. at 995 (but for privileges, there would be a loss of trust in enforcement).

a teenager, a couple of years becoming student government president. United Nations Convention on the Rts. of the Child, Pt. 1, arts. 16 & 27(1) (effective 1995) (kid's own status) (mandatory executive agreement). The current peril is probably intertwined with Patel's social and political behavior related to this matter. Id. and Int'l Covenant of Civ. & Pol. Rts. (effective 1992) (mandatory authority). The United States executive branch is in an international agreement to enforce United Nations Convention on the Rts. of the Child's protection, but it is confusing why the stress was elevated and turned on in 2014 (and once again in 2017, etc.), that has now caused morbid obesity, because Patel was due and protected by his own pretty privilege of cis gender male assignment – other than prevent his own presidential campaign. See *supra*, p. 11 n. 11. Every minute under this unwarranted stress situation is a minute lost in shaping Patel's own identity for his presidential campaign. Int'l Covenant of Civ. & Pol. Rts. (effective 1992) (mandatory authority). Therefore, the court should issue mandamus.

Therefore, Patel has immunity to all force from the United States Constitution. U.S. const. art. IV, § 2. The absolute rule is that neither the federal nor state sovereign (and other local governments) has power that the common law Basis officials do not have. Nixon, 457 U.S. at 770. Federalist No. 42 & 80. Power is devolved to these sovereigns and the Seat. Id. The Seat handles and manages the operations of the community's resources according to its constitution of laws and agreements. Id. & U.S. const. art. VI, § 1. Patel needs to have his immunity administered and enforced again, and the court cannot "deny" it. U.S. const. art. IV, § 1 & amend. XIV, § 1. No officer or official of the United States has immunity from this civil action. Nixon, 457 U.S. at 789. Therefore, the court has at least one clear reason to grant mandamus.

After the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, this court has the independent inherent responsibility of enforcing the privileges and immunities clause of Section 1

of Article 1 of the Amendment. U.S. const. amend. XIV, § 1. Protection of the United States and appreciation a state officer's own immunity is an unconditional and first promise of the United States Constitution. Corfield v. Coryell, 6 Fed. Cas. 546, 552 (C.C.E.D.Pa. 1823) ("Protection by the government"). Madison, Madison, & Yates. Federalist No. 42 & 80. Federalist 78 makes it clear that the independent judiciary cannot participate in the "wealth of society," which is an inherent State, and Treasury, affair but also reverted back to the President. Gonzales, 348 U.S. at 412. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(c)(1) of "license" is premised and relies almost exclusively on the privileges and/or immunities clauses. U.S. const. amend. V & amend. XIV. Congress, much like Parliament, are the more recent delegate of the people and of the latest survivors of the inherently violent Basis. Federalist No. 42 & 80. Congress has therefore authorized THE HONORABLE of this court to form a Big Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a), contract to enforce its own rulings. Trauma Serv. Grp. v. United States, 104 F.3d 1321, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 1997); City of Joliet v. New W., L.P., 921 F.3d 693, 698 (7th Cir. 2019); & In re Compl. of Ingram Barge Co., 194 F. Supp. 3d 766, 803 (N.D. Ill. 2016). Therefore, the court should grant mandamus and use any of the necessary Tucker Act powers to enforce its own mandamus. See generally Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau v. ITT Educ. Servs., Inc., 219 F. Supp. 3d 878, 893 (S.D.I.N. 2015).

Patel is a religious minority because of his royal heritage.[15] The United States is in an international treaty to protect people of social and/or political heritage, including but not limited to royals. Int'l Covenant of Civ. & Pol. Rts. (effective 1992) (mandatory authority). The International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights went into effect in 1992. Id. and Vectrus Servs. A/S, 164 Fed. Cl. at 767(citing Valentine, 299 U.S. at 10 ("Moreover, the Supreme Court explained that "[i]t is a familiar rule that the obligations of treaties

[15] Payne-Elliott v. Roman Cath. Archdiocese of Indpls., Inc., 193 N.E.3d 1009, 1013 (Ind. 2022) (Church autonomy doctrine is irrelevant as they are not authorized to touch anyone.).

should be liberally construed so as to give effect to the apparent intention of the parties.")) (citing Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law). Lawless violence on Patel undoubtedly disparages Patel's own social status, and the main function of the United States Constitution is State affairs or protect every citizen's or state actors' status and other Ordered Liberties. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc., 472 U.S. 749, 758, 769, & 787 (1985) ("his own good name"). U.S. const. amend. XIV, § 1. Even with limited resources, Patel is living in an unfair state of being. Villars v. United States, 590 F. App'x 962 * 3-4, 6& 9 (Fed. Cir. 2014). The United States must terminate the unconsented and nonconsensual intervening causes Patel has discussed herein. Calvert Fire Ins. Co., 560 F.2d at 795. The current peril, attacking the entirety of his lifestyle and public life, against Plaintiff, a likeable or well-liked and revered citizen and global/international United States basis official has the smell of racism (colorism), and treaties mandate interpretation, as a matter of law – if quakes like a duck, if it looks like a duck, then it's a duck. See generally Int'l Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (effective 1994) (mandatory authority). See e.g., Students for Fair Admissions, Inc., No. 20-1199 * 15 & 36 (U.S. 2023) (racism mandates an analysis of the Privileges & Immunities clause and the Equal Protection Cl.) (*dicta*) (Ordered Liberty is no longer on mute) and Teague, 489 U.S. at 296 & 315 (*dicta*) (Ordered Liberty & Equal Protection Cl.-Equity). 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000bb et seq. The right to recovery, including through equitable § 1361 or § 1651 mandamus, is the principle of equal justice under law. Boag v. MacDougall, 454 U.S. 364, 368 (1982) and Boddie v. Connecticut, 401 U.S. 371, 389 (1971). Therefore, the court should grant mandamus. Int'l Covenant of Civ. & Pol. Rts. (effective 1992) (mandatory authority); United Nations Convention on the Rts. of the Child, Pt. 1, arts. 16 & 27(1) (effective 1995) (kid's own status) (mandatory executive agreement); Convention

Against Torture & Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (effective 1966) (mandatory authority); Int'l Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (effective 1994) (mandatory authority); and Int'l Covenant on Econ., Soc. & Cultural Rts. (effective 1977) (mandatory executive agreement). Hazelhurst Oil Mill Fertilizer Co. v. United States, 42 F.2d 331, 340 (Fed. Cir. 1930) (the court must attempt to get contract onto "equal terms"). See Fed R. Civ. P. 8(c) affirmative defense.

Patel is being caused to involuntary serve. U.S. const. amend. XIII. Patel means no equivocation while speaking about equivocations in that the current situation seems that Rosseau's dream that "kings become the slaves" is coming true. Talbot v. Jansen, 3 U.S. 133, 139-40 & 164 (1795). Or, that Leo Tolesty scholars are witnessing a new pattern that "Kings are the slaves of history." Id. Plato would say that what is true for Kings is true for his people, masters, slaves, and the Kings' future ancestors. Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244, 297 n. 10 (1901) (Free Soil Party resolution: "Congress has no more power to make a slave than to make a king; no more power to institute or establish slavery than to institute or establish a monarchy. No such power can be found among those specifically conferred by the Constitution, or derived by any just implication from them."). The statement that the President of the United States is not a king is simply a spiritual one to show the distinction of the chief of state. Federalist 69. That is not say that presidents of the Basis of the United States who devolve power to the Seat President are kings; nevertheless, they are the ones designed to be with the most authority and power. Cf. Talbot, 3 U.S. at 140 ("basis of society"). The environment might have changed, too much, for someone; thus, Patel might be in a "patriotic" showing that the people are in power. Id. In fact, Patel does not even want to be filing these judicial cases, help create precedent, or help test the national consciousness. Int'l Covenant of Civ. & Pol. Rts. (effective 1992). The Supreme Court has signaled that the

federal courts need to create the order of Ordered Liberty. See *supra*, p. 9 n. 3. This is neither play nor fair play. Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer, 582 U.S. 449, 468 (2017) (Thomas, J., concurring); Espinoza v. Montana Dep't of Revenue, 140 S. Ct. 2246, 2254 (U.S. 2020); and Corp. of Presiding Bishop of Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints v. Amos, 483 U.S. 327, 334-35 (1987). 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(c). The matter is too circumstantial where the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* applies. See e.g., Del. Coach Co. v. Reynolds, 71 A.2d 69, 73 (Del. 1950). The court needs to act immediately and issue mandamus.

Furthermore, it is constitutionally assumed, consistent with the Father of the Constitution, that it is irregular for the Oval Office or the Executive Branch not to protect a law-abiding citizen, even because Due Process cannot shed the natural-born's protection of the United States citizen. Gonzales, 348 U.S. at 412 ("underlying concepts of procedural regularity and basic fair play"). Corfield v. Coryell, 6 Fed. Cas. 546, 552 (C.C.E.D.Pa. 1823) ("Protection by the government"). U.S. const. amend. V & amend. XIV.

The Burnett v. Bowen, 830 F.2d 731, 739 (7th Cir. 1987) factors are satisfied: (1) Patel has a clear right to relief to be protected by the superior laws of the United States as a natural-born citizen and independently as a State actor (letters patent of title and office self-issues by the United States Constitution that is king to the Basis officials), e.g. Federalist Nos. 42, 69, & 80 (2) the executive enforcement agreements herein cause the "plainly defined and peremptory duty on the part of the respondent to do the act in question," cf. Briehl v. Dulles, 248 F.2d 561, 567 (D.C. Cir. 1957) (here, though, the President might have discretion, although I argue that he does not under the original and amended constitution, see Federalist 69 ("The king of Great Britain is emphatically and truly styled the fountain of honor. He not only appoints to all offices, but can create offices. He can confer

titles of nobility at pleasure; and has the disposal of an immense number of church preferments. There is evidently a great inferiority in the power of the President, in this particular, to that of the British king; nor is it equal to that of the governor of New York, if we are to interpret the meaning of the constitution of the State by the practice which has obtained under it."), but not the Secretary of State who has the peremptory obligation to act or a minister duty) (see Harlow, 457 U.S. at 811 n. 17), see NTEU, 492 F.2d at 604, and cf. Bauer v. Acheson 106 F. Supp. 445, 449 (D.D.C. 1952) (political matter, unlike here, was entirely up to the Secretary of State), and (3) Patel has done his due diligence by contacting all jurisdictions he can think of and no other adequate remedy at law exists. Thomas, 750 F.3d at 903. Ganem, 746 F.2d at 852. Swan, 100 F.3d at 978. Marbury, 5 U.S. at 163. See *supra*, p. 8 n. 2. Will, 389 U.S. at 96. It would be an abuse of discretion not to issue mandamus. Cheney, 542 U.S. at 367. Harlow, 457 U.S. at 811 n. 17.

Therefore, mandamus should issue, as a matter of law, including to the President for urgent due delegation. Marbury, 5 U.S. at 167 (judiciary has a right to issue writ of mandamus to President). Cf. Glob. Relief Found. Inc. v. O'Neill, 207 F. Supp. 2d 779, 796-7 (N.D. Ill. 2002). Jury trial be reserved for the alternate.

And, in the alternative, I move that this court show cause of an alternate adequate remedy at law. Cheney, 542 U.S. at 367.

OBJECTION TO FILING BAR

The Supreme Court states that filing bars are unwarranted unless the Federal district court can find, without abusing discretion, that Plaintiff's conduct does rises to a level of "callous disregard" or "flagrant bad faith" of all duties owed to the court or the opposing side. Nat'l Hockey League v. Metro. Hockey Club, Inc., 427 U.S. 639, 640 (1976). Here, Patel has followed all duties to the court and the opposing side. Therefore, a sufficient reason or grant of authority does not exist to issue a filing bar. Dkt. 18.

Patel is not a restricted filer in the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit for the same reason, because Plaintiff's conduct does rises to a level of "callous disregard" or "flagrant bad faith" of all duties owed to the court or the opposing side. Nat'l Hockey League, 427 U.S. at 640. Contra. Patel v. Doe et. al., No. 23-1322 (7th Cir. 2023), ECF 7. But see Patel v. United States, No. 22-7472 (U.S. 202_) and In Re Raj K. Patel, No. 22-7473 (U.S. 202_). Mind you, Patel has had the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana reversed for not remanding an objectively unreasonable notice of removal. Patel v. Univ. of Notre Dame, No. 22-2251 (7th Cir. 2023), ECF 30. Therefore, the district court should let future appeals for through. Dkt. 18.

I move that the court prevent the issuing of the filing bar.

CONCLUSION

- Grant Mandamus and prevent the filing bar from issuing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Raj K. Patel
Rama CCCX
T.E., T.E. Mr. Raj K. Patel, AA, BA, Former JD Candidate (*pro se*)
6850 East 21st Street
Indianapolis, IN 46219
Marion County
317-450-6651 (cell)
rajp2010@gmail.com
www.rajpatel.live

T.E. Mr. President/Student Body President, Student Gov't Ass'n of Emory U., Inc. 2013-2014 (corp. sovereign 2013-present)

T.E. Mr. Student Body President, Brownsburg Cmty. Sch. Corp./President, Brownsburg High Sch. Student Gov't 2009-2010 (corp. sovereign 2009-present)
Rep. from the Notre Dame L. Sch. Student B. Ass'n to the Ind. St. B. Ass'n 2017
Deputy Regional Director, Young Democrats of Am.-High Sch. Caucus 2007-2009
Co-Founder & Vice Chair, Ind. High Sch. Democrats 2009-2010
Vice President of Fin. (Indep.), Oxford C. Republicans of Emory U., Inc. 2011-2012

Intern, Jill Long Thompson for Governor (2008)

Volunteer, Barack Obama for Am. (2008)

Intern, Marion Cnty. Clerk Elizabeth "Beth" White for Sec'y of St. of the St. of Ind. (2014)

*Former J.D. Candidate, Notre Dame L. Sch. (2015-17)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I served a copy of the foregoing *Pro Se* Mot. to Reconsider with Object to Filing Bar on 7/31/2023 to below individuals via the Clerk of Court and e-mail:

The United States
AG Merrick Garland
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington DC 20530

The United States
Morris Pasqual Eastern Division (Chicago)
219 S. Dearborn St., Suite 500
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 353-5300
USAILN.InternetWebmaster@usdoj.gov

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Raj Patel
T.E., T.E. Raj K. Patel (*Pro Se*)
6850 East 21st Street
Indianapolis, IN 46219
317-450-6651 (cell)
rajp2010@gmail.com
www.rajpatel.live

Dated: July 31, 2023